

3RD STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1991 The Times Mirror Company;  
Los Angeles Times

January 29, 1991, Tuesday, Home Edition  
Correction Appended

SECTION: Part A; Page 6; Column 3; Foreign Desk

LENGTH: 626 words

HEADLINE: ENVIRONMENTAL WEAPON USED BEFORE;

STRATEGY: THE SOVIETS HAVE STUDIED ECOLOGICAL TACTICS FOR YEARS. IRAQIS USED THEM ON A SMALL SCALE AGAINST IRAN.

BYLINE: By KAREN TUMULTY, TIMES STAFF WRITER

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

When Kuwaiti oil began gushing into the Persian Gulf, the appalled Western World assumed that Saddam Hussein had discovered a new and devastating weapon that was immediately denounced as "environmental terrorism."

But while President Bush has declared that there is "no rationality" to such tactics, they have in fact been under intense study for years by military strategists in a number of countries -- particularly in the Soviet Union, where much of Iraq's military got its training.

References to "ecological weapons" have been appearing in Soviet military texts since about 1986, said Ilana Kass, a specialist on the Soviet military at the Pentagon's National War College in Washington. She added that this research could be the inspiration, direct or indirect, for the Iraqi president's desperate ploy of releasing millions of barrels of crude oil into Persian Gulf waters.

Methods of environmental warfare were spelled out most clearly, she added, in "Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction," a 399-page, Russian-language textbook published in 1989. Though little-known outside the Soviet Union, 100,000 copies of the text were printed for use as a reference work by the Soviet army.

In that book, Gen. V. V. Myasnikov wrote that it is possible to "make use of destructive forces occurring in nature for military purposes." He said the weapons open to military use include "flooding and pollution to disrupt navigation and disable irrigation and other hydro-structures and create obstructions in rivers, canals and other bodies of water."

Kass said she was startled to find a discussion of such tactics -- an apparent blueprint for igniting the current environmental crisis in the Persian Gulf -- in an unclassified textbook.

"If research like that were done in Western countries, it would be very closely held, primarily because of the public backlash it would create," she said.

**LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS**

(c) 1991 Los Angeles Times, January 29, 1991

Kass noted that thousands of Iraqi officials have trained intensively at Soviet military academies as part of their country's contracts to purchase weapons from the Soviet Union.

Also, the Soviet Union has sent thousands of its own military personnel to Iraq as advisers to teach the Iraqis how to use the war machinery that it has sold them.

However, military analyst Anthony Cordesman insisted: "This kind of concept is not something one can blame on the Soviets."

Iraq itself had employed the environmental weapon on a smaller scale during its eight-year war with Iran -- a war that predated most references found in Soviet military textbooks. During the war with Iran, Iraq shifted the courses of rivers and ignited dammed-up marsh areas to create barriers against Iranian troops.

There are ample historical precedents for the use of the environment as a weapon.

When Japan invaded China in the late 1930s, for example, the militarily weaker Chinese forces bombed the dikes that held back the Yellow River, causing major floods.

"It's the only thing they had against this modern force coming at them," said Alfred Wilhelm, vice president of the Atlantic Council, a Washington-based public policy group.

#### BACKGROUND

One of two 1977 protocols that supplement the four 1949 Geneva Conventions on protecting civilians in time of war bans acts that lead to environmental disasters such as the oil slick in the Persian Gulf. It states: "The environment itself must be protected against widespread, long-term and severe damage. Methods of warfare likely to cause such damage and thereby jeopardize the health or survival of the population are forbidden." Neither the United States nor Iraq has ratified the protocol, but Britain and France have, along with Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Qatar, Syria, Italy and Canada among the allied countries.

CORRECTION-DATE: February 1, 1991, Friday, Home Edition

CORRECTION:  
FOR THE RECORD

Oil Spill -- A background box in Tuesday's Times misidentified the international treaty that may have been violated by Iraq's alleged release of oil into the Persian Gulf. The treaty is the Environmental Modification Convention of 1977. In addition, it is not clear whether the oil spill is governed by one of two 1977 protocols to the 1949 Geneva Conventions. France, Canada and Britain were mistakenly listed as having ratified those protocols.

TYPE: Infobox

(c) 1991 Los Angeles Times, January 29, 1991

SUBJECT: GENEVA CONVENTIONS; ENVIRONMENT; PROPERTY DAMAGE; OPERATION DESERT  
STORM; OIL SPILLS -- PERSIAN GULF; MILITARY STRATEGY; TERRORISM -- IRAQ;  
SABOTAGE; OCEAN POLLUTION -- PERSIAN GULF; FIRES -- KUWAIT; WEAPONS

**LEXIS<sup>®</sup> NEXIS<sup>®</sup> LEXIS<sup>®</sup> NEXIS<sup>®</sup>**

4TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1991 Reuters

January 28, 1991, Monday, BC cycle

SECTION: Money Report. Market Moving.

LENGTH: 276 words

HEADLINE: GULF WAR STATES NOT PARTY TO ENVIRONMENT PROTOCOL

DATELINE: GENEVA, JAN 28, REUTER

BODY:

A Geneva protocol on protecting civilians during war forbids measures leading to environmental disasters, but leading Gulf War combatants including Iraq have not ratified the document.

The first of two 1977 protocols which supplement the four 1949 Geneva conventions on protecting people in time of war states, "The environment itself must be protected against widespread, long-term and severe damage.

"Methods of warfare likely to cause such damage and thereby jeopardise the health or survival of the population are forbidden."

President Cornelio Sommaruga of the International Committee of the Red Cross, which considers itself a watchdog of international humanitarian law, said unfortunately several of the combatants were not party to the protocol.

"It is regrettable that if we take the present situation of the parties to the conflict of the Middle East we have...A number of countries that have not ratified it," he told a news conference.

The allies confronting Baghdad say Iraq opened crude oil taps in Kuwait as an act of environmental terrorism, creating a slick 35 miles long and 10 miles wide. They say their precision bombing of offshore outlet pipes on Saturday stemmed the flow.

Iraq charged at first that the slick was caused by allied bombing of oil tankers and then asserted that it was caused by Saturday's bombing of the pipes in Kuwait.

Sommaruga said neither Iraq, the United States, Britain nor France had ratified the protocol, which has many ramifications other than environmental. Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Qatar, Syria, Italy and Canada were among those which had ratified it.

15TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1990 The British Broadcasting Corporation;  
Summary of World Broadcasts

February 26, 1990, Monday

SECTION: Part 1 The USSR; A. INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS; 1. GENERAL AND WESTERN  
AFFAIRS

PAGE: SU/D698/A1/ 1

LENGTH: 336 words

HEADLINE: DEFENCE MINISTRY ENFORCING GENEVA CONVENTIONS

SOURCE: Tass in Russian for abroad 1155 (and in English 1240) gmt 22 Feb 90

Text of report by Oleg Moskovskiy

BODY:

A decree by Soviet Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov has enforced in the USSR Armed Forces international standards of humanitarian law and two additional protocols to them, adopted by the Geneva Conventions of 12th August, 1949. Commenting on this today, Maj-Gen Leonid Ivashov, chief executive officer of the Soviet Defence Ministry, recalled that the USSR Supreme Soviet had ratified the protocols of the Geneva Conventions on 4th August 1989, and in view of this had entrusted the USSR Council of Ministers with the task of submitting proposals for introducing changes in Soviet legislation.

Ivashov said that the standards of humanitarian law enforced in the Soviet Armed Forces by this decree concern the improvement of the treatment of the sick and wounded in the regular army, the treatment of prisoners-of-war, protection of the civilian population during a war, and also two additional protocols concerning the protection of victims of international armed conflicts and armed conflicts of a non-international nature.

Ivashov believes that the entire system of training in the USSR Armed Forces and the planning of combat operations should be built strictly in line with international standards of humanitarian law.

'The enforcement of these standards is totally consistent with Soviet defensive doctrine and the Soviet State's foreign policy as a whole,' Ivashov stressed. He added that this step also accorded with the recognition of the priority of human values.

Ivashov said that changes taking into account the standards of international humanitarian law would soon be introduced in all normative acts of the Defence Ministry and the general military regulations of the USSR Armed Forces. 'The requirements of the aforementioned documents will from now on be considered even in conducting studies and training,' Ivashov stressed.

Ivashov said that units will employ legal counsellors to monitor observance of the standards in the Army and Navy and also to help commanders apply them.

17TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1990 Federal Information Systems Corporation;  
Federal News Service

February 21, 1990, WEDNESDAY

SECTION: OFFICIAL KREMLIN INT'L NEWS BROADCAST - NEWS/CURRENT EVENTS

LENGTH: 328 words

HEADLINE: Vremya February 21, 1990

KEYWORD: February 21, 1990

BODY:

Igor Fesunenکو, anchorman: "The USSR Defense Minister has signed the order on the declaration of the Geneva conventions and supplementary protocols in order that our country's armed forces be guided by them." A. Barkhatov, correspondent: "We have become the 83rd country to ratify both supplementary protocols for the Geneva Conventions of 1949 on protection of victims of international and non-international conflicts. By the way, powers such as the United States of America, Great Britain, and the FRG have not yet put their signatures next to ours. But we shall not appeal to someone else's history. Let's appeal to ours." I. I. Kotlyarov, head of the group for international law in the USSR Defense Ministry Administration: "The Geneva Convention on prisoners of war was signed in 1949. The Soviet Union did not sign it. Well, I think that at that period, Stalin's period, there were significant doubts regarding loyalty of citizens in general, including servicemen. And it was assumed that a sufficiently good and easy regime for prisoners of war could prompt Soviet citizens to treason. Norms of these conventions regulate the forbidden methods and means of conducting war, the legal statute of prisoners of war, of those injured, sick, or shipwreck victims." Barkhatov: "Can you name anything more specific? What happens when someone gives himself up, for example? Let's assume there is a situation like this." Kotlyarov: "They are treated humanely, torture and violence are forbidden, as well as experiments, humiliation, and so forth." Barkhatov: "But why, after all, for the past 12 years the Defense Ministry had not been acting as an envoy who would force the way to the ratification? Why was it ratified only this year? The Ministry always kept in the background. What do you think?" Kotlyarov: "I think one of the reasons, after all, was that the leading powers - from a military point of view - did not ratify this particular convention."

54TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1987 The New York Times Company;  
The New York Times

March 5, 1987, Thursday, Late City Final Edition

SECTION: Section A; Page 26, Column 5; Editorial Desk

LENGTH: 341 words

HEADLINE: Geneva Convention No Prop to Terrorism

BODY:

To the Editor:

'Denied: A Shield for Terrorists' (editorial, Feb. 17), which supports President Reagan's decision not to seek ratification of revisions to the 1949 Geneva Convention on laws of war, fundamentally misconstrues those revisions. The 1977 Geneva Protocol I will not confer legitimacy on terrorist groups, nor will it provide terrorist groups with possible grounds for treatment as prisoners of war; nor does it allow regional groups to decide which 'peoples' constitute a legitimate party in an armed conflict.

The Preamble to Protocol I states, 'nothing in this protocol . . . can be construed as legitimizing or authorizing any act of aggression or any other use of force inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations.' Thus, by its very terms, Protocol I does not provide a 'shield' for terrorist groups.

Furthermore, Article 96 of the treaty provides that its protections cannot be claimed by any 'people' that does not formally accept all the obligations of the Geneva Conventions and of Protocol I. No terrorist group worthy of the name would be willing to undertake such responsibilities. In the 10 years since the adoption of Protocol I, no national liberation movement has filed a declaration accepting these obligations.

Protocol I is a valuable and long-overdue addition to humanitarian law. It is carefully drafted, and many of its provisions represent victories for the United States negotiating position at the time. At best, the criticisms leveled at the treaty reflect a fundamental misreading of its terms.

More likely, as with President Reagan, they reflect a distrust of international law and of the too-infrequent efforts to extend its protections. Indeed, President Reagan's rejection of the treaty is further evidence of his disregard of the international legal order and his desire to sabotage its most important and fragile accomplishments.

BRADLEY G. KULMAN

Charlottesville, Va., Feb. 17, 1987

The writer is editor in chief of the Virginia Journal of International Law.

TYPE: Letter

SUBJECT: TERRORISM

NAME: KULMAN, BRADLEY G; REAGAN, RONALD WILSON (PRES)

55TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1987 The New York Times Company;  
The New York Times

February 17, 1987, Tuesday, Late City Final Edition

SECTION: Section A; Page 22, Column 1; Editorial Desk

LENGTH: 361 words

HEADLINE: Denied: A Shield for Terrorists

BODY:

President Reagan has faced more important but probably no tougher decisions than whether to seek ratification of revisions to the 1949 Geneva Conventions. If he said yes, that would improve protection for prisoners of war and civilians in wartime, but at the price of new legal protection for guerrillas and possible terrorists. He decided to say no, a judgment that deserves support.

The 1949 Geneva Convention on laws of war needs updating. The lines have blurred separating civilians and combatants and regular and irregular troops. In 1977, a protocol packed with valuable additions was signed by a hundred nations, including the United States, pending Senate ratification. The new provisions strengthen procedures for extraditing and prosecuting terrorists, make it easier to punish the taking of hostages and the indiscriminate use of force, enhance rights to check on troops missing in action and prisoners of war, and add protection for medical personnel.

Article 1 of the protocol, however, says that the provisions apply to nations and 'peoples' who 'are fighting against colonial domination and alien occupation and against racist regimes in the exercise of their right of self-determination.' Nice words, but also possible grounds for giving terrorists the legal status of P.O.W.'s. The protocol also provides that regional groups like the Organization for African Unity and the League of Arab States could decide which 'peoples' constituted a legitimate party in armed conflict.

The President could have asked the Senate to ratify with reservations. But that would have opened the door to all signatories to pick and choose what to obey. Nations might also have read that as legitimizing terrorists. So Mr. Reagan made the sound choice. He notified the Senate that he would not submit the revision or protocol because it was 'fundamentally and irreconcilably flawed.'

Apparently many nations are having second thoughts. Only about 40 signatories have ratified the protocol, not including the Soviet Union, France or Israel. Another international meeting is in order to plug the dangerous loopholes and reaffirm the important new benefits.

TYPE: Editorial

SUBJECT: WAR AND REVOLUTION; EDITORIALS; PRISONERS OF WAR; CIVIL WAR AND GUERRILLA WARFARE; TERRORISM; UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

ORGANIZATION: GENEVA CONVENTIONS (1949)

**LEXIS<sup>®</sup> NEXIS<sup>®</sup> LEXIS<sup>®</sup> NEXIS<sup>®</sup>**



(c) 1987 The New York Times, February 17, 1987

NAME: REAGAN, RONALD WILSON (PRES)

56TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1987 The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc.;  
Daily Report For Executives

February 3, 1987, Tuesday

SECTION: CONGRESSIONAL AND PRESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY; LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR;  
President; DER No. 21; Pg. F-2

LENGTH: 495 words

HEADLINE: 100th Congress, First Session Monday, Feb. 2, 1987

**BODY:**

The President Feb. 2 met with Italian Foreign Minister Giulio Andreotti to discuss the President's official visit to Italy in June and the Venice Economic Summit, prospects for arms control, and East-West scientific cooperation.

The President Feb. 2 accepted "with reluctance and deep regret" the resignation of William Casey as CIA director. He also announced his intention to nominate Robert Gates, the acting CIA director, to replace Casey. The White House said Casey has been invited to be a counselor to the President if and when he is able to return to work after his hospitalization for cancer ends.

The President Feb. 2 issued Executive Order 12582, on naturalization requirements exceptions for aliens and non-citizen nationals of the U.S. who served in the Grenada campaign.

The President Feb. 2 designated the week of March 15, 1987, as National Poison Prevention Week.

The President Feb. 2 announced his intention to nominate David Sentelle to be a judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

The President Feb. 2 announced his intention to nominate Robert Charrow and Wilkes Robinson to be judges of the U.S. Claims Court.

The President Feb. 2 announced his intention to nominate James Zagel and James Alesia to be judges of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

The President Feb. 2 announced his intention to nominate Layn Phillips to be a judge of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma.

The President Feb. 2 announced his intention to nominate Ronald Lew to be a judge of the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California.

The President Jan. 30 designated Richard Goldberg, deputy undersecretary of Agriculture for international and commodity programs, to be a member of the board of directors of the Rural Telephone Bank.

The President Jan. 30 announced his intention to nominate Jack Matlock to be ambassador to the Soviet Union.

The President Jan. 30 announced his intention to nominate Bohdan Futey to be a judge of the U.S. Claims Court.

**LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®**

(c) 1987 Daily Report For Executives, February 3, 1987

The President Jan. 29 transmitted to the Senate for ratification Protocol II Additional to the Geneva Conventions, making clear that any deliberate killing of a non-combatant in the course of a no-international armed conflict is a violation of the laws of war and a crime against humanity.

The President Jan. 29 sent a letter to House and Senate leaders transmitting a bimonthly report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question.

The White House Feb. 2 said the President is willing to give congressional investigators "excerpts from his personal notes" on the Iran-contra affair if the material is needed to complete the investigations.

#### The President's Appointments

Monday, Feb. 2

Morning - White House staff; national security briefing; meeting with Italian Foreign Minister Giulio Andreotti.

Afternoon - Issues briefing lunch; greets Penn State football team.

58TH STORY of Level 1 printed in VAR KWIC format.

Copyright (c) 1986 Council on Foreign Relations, Inc.;  
Foreign Affairs

1986, Summer

SECTION: Pg. 901

LENGTH: 9122 words

HEADLINE: TERRORISM AND THE LAW

BYLINE: Abraham D. Sofaer; Abraham D. Sofaer is Legal Adviser to the Department of State. Previously, he was a federal district judge in New York. This article is based on the Sulzbacher Lecture delivered at the Columbia University School of Law, April 5, 1986. Legal citations have not been included to facilitate ease of reading; they are available from the Office of the Legal Adviser, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C. 20520.

BODY:

... Conference on the Reaffirmation of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflict, which met between 1974 and 1977. The conference, under the auspices of the International Committee for the Red Cross (ICRC), was called to improve the laws of war set forth in the Geneva conventions of 1949. It produced two additional protocols to the Geneva conventions: Protocol I dealing with international, and Protocol II with non-international, armed conflict. The United States participated in the Geneva conference and signed the protocols, but the President has decided not to seek Senate ratification of Protocol I, and has decided to seek several reservations and understandings as conditions to the ratification of Protocol II.

The ICRC and the conference developed many constructive ideas to help minimize the suffering of combatants and noncombatants in armed conflict. But from the beginning of the conference, an effort was made to extend the law of international armed conflicts to cover activities of the Palestine Liberation ...

... military deployment preceding the launching of an attack in which he is to participate." Furthermore, the section provides that "acts which comply with the requirements of this paragraph shall not be considered as perfidious" -- for example, feigning protected status prior to a military engagement by using signs, emblems or uniforms of the United Nations, or nations that are not parties to the conflict.

These changes in traditional rules undermine the notion that the protocol has secured an advantage for humanitarian law by granting revolutionary groups protection as combatants. Under the Geneva conventions, a terrorist could not hide among civilians until just before an attack. Under Protocol I, he may do so; he need only carry his arms openly while he is visibly engaged in a deployment or while he is in an ...

... other words, all the people living in a country determined to have a racist government would be deemed to be hostages, and the government to be a hostage-taker.

**LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS**

(c) 1986 Foreign Affairs

These radical proposals were eventually rejected during the 1979 session. Advocates of political violence did, however, win a significant victory. The nations that opposed excluding liberation movements from the coverage of the convention were required to accept a reference, in Protocol I to the 1949 Geneva conventions, to the treatment of national liberation fighters as combatants. This reaffirmation took the form of Article 12 of the hostage-taking convention, which provides that, to the extent the 1949 Geneva conventions and the 1977 additional protocols impose substantively identical obligations with regard to an instance of hostage-taking, the hostage-taking convention will not apply to the armed conflicts ("in which peoples are fighting against colonial domination and alien occupation and against racist ...

68TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1985 The Times Mirror Company;  
Los Angeles Times

July 22, 1985, Monday, Late Final Edition

SECTION: Part 1; Page 2; Column 1; Late Final Desk

LENGTH: 279 words

HEADLINE: PENTAGON AGAINST PLAN TO ALTER GENEVA CONVENTIONS

BYLINE: By AP

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended that the United States reject changes in the 1949 Geneva Conventions governing war prisoners because the revisions could be read as applying to national liberation movements and terrorists, officials said today.

The revisions, signed by Carter Administration officials but never submitted to the Senate for ratification, are undergoing a final review by the State Department, the officials said.

"The secretary and the Joint Chiefs have notified the secretary of state of our position," said a Pentagon official who spoke on condition of anonymity.

"We are essentially opposed to Protocol I," the official said. "Basically, we think it abets terrorism."

The proposed revisions of the 1949 Geneva Conventions were negotiated under the auspices of the International Committee of the Red Cross from 1974 to 1977.

The revisions were divided into two so-called protocols -- the first dealing with international armed conflicts and the second with non-international conflicts.

More than 100 nations have signed the protocols, but only about 40 have formally ratified them. Only formal ratification gives the treaty actual legal force.

As outlined today by Pentagon sources, the first set of protocols is particularly worrisome because the language defining combat and soldiers is so vague that distinctions between guerrillas and regular soldiers are blurred.

As a result, guerrillas could claim the same protection granted regular prisoners of war and thus avoid prosecution under criminal statutes for what might otherwise be considered terrorist acts, the sources said.

TYPE:  
Wire

70TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Proprietary to the United Press International 1985

July 22, 1985, Monday, PM cycle

SECTION: Washington News

LENGTH: 454 words

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

KEYWORD:  
Jointchiefs

BODY:

There are problems with U.S. ratification of internationally agreed upon revisions of the 1949 Geneva Conventions, particularly those relating to national liberation movements, White House spokesman Larry Speakes said today.

The revisions, or protocols, were negotiated between 1974 and 1977 and signed by the Carter administration in 1977 'with the understanding that a decision on ratification would await a formal study by the Joint Chiefs.'

The New York Times reported today that most officials now consider it 'highly unlikely' that President Reagan will recommend Senate ratification in the face of strong objections from the military.

Signing obligates a nation to act in accordance with the treaty, but only formal ratification gives the treaty legal force, the newspaper noted.

Speakes said the Pentagon, the State Department and the Joint Chiefs are studying the revisions.

'There are problems with these protocols ... concerning national liberation movements,' he told reporters. 'We'll continue to study them.'

The Times quoted unidentified Reagan administration officials as saying the Joint Chiefs had recommended against ratification, but did not say when the recommendation was made.

The protocols, which are intended to ensure humane treatment of combatants and civilians during war, are still under consideration by other foreign and military policy agencies, the Times said.

The Times said the military was concerned that the revisions would result in legitimizing national liberation movements and terrorists, granting them combatant and prisoner of war status, the Times said.

More than 100 nations have signed the revised accords and more than 40 have ratified them, the newspaper said.

Several European allies also are moving toward ratification, although France is not expected to ratify Protocol I, which deals with international armed conflicts, and Israel is not expected to ratify Potocol I or Protocol II on non-international conflicts, the newspaper said.

Proprietary to the United Press International, July 22, 1985

The Times said the administration's objections are to Protocol I. Under it, groups such as the Organization of African Unity would judge whether liberation movements are legitimate parties to an armed conflict.

Critics say the wording is so vague that guerrillas and terrorists would have the same degree of international protection, including the right to prisoner of war status, as regular soldiers.

They also say sovereign countries might have difficulty prosecuting terrorists under their own laws.

The Times said the accord was signed by the United States -- which does not constitute ratification -- in part to enhance the nation's ability to gain an accounting of soldiers missing in action in Vietnam.



94TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1977 The Washington Post

June 11, 1977, Saturday, Final Edition

SECTION: First Section; Around the World; A12

LENGTH: 100 words

HEADLINE: Geneva Conventions

BYLINE: From staff reports and news dispatches

DATELINE: GENEVA

BODY:

Some 100 nations completed four years of work by signing two controversial additions to the Geneva conventions on the rules of war.

One protocol gives full Red Cross protection to guerrillas fighting in international conflicts, against colonial domination, against alien occupation, or against a racist regime.

Another is aimed at protecting civilian populations, including an article that prohibits terrorist acts or threats against civilians.

Israel was the only participating country that refused to sign the two protocols after the Palestine Liberation Organization was permitted to sign.